

Supply—External Affairs

the amount of foreign exchange they can spend abroad on arms to carry on their war against Malaysia. The more wheat flour or wheat or anything else in the nature of food we give to President Sukarno, the more foreign exchange is released to purchase arms for him to carry on his aggression against Malaysia. As I have already indicated, we have not had the slightest indication that the wheat flour ever gets to the Indonesian people, who may well need it. We suspect it probably goes to the Indonesian army, which is engaged in aggression.

As I have mentioned on other occasions, if there is a food shortage in Indonesia that is the fault of the government of the country. There is no country in the world which has more arable and fertile land per head of population than Indonesia. It is merely because the economy has been mismanaged that there is a food shortage, coupled with their aggressive actions against their neighbours, first of all against Netherlands New Guinea, now against Malaysia, and possibly in the future against the Philippines or Australia. At least the Australians think there is some sort of danger to them, and are having conscription.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): And they are giving assistance to Indonesia.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister says they are giving assistance to Indonesia. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Well, I am telling you.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister says he is telling me. That is fine. He may have information about this, so perhaps he could tell us what form this aid is taking, how much it is and if they are still giving it.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Yes, they still are.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister says they still are. I cannot explain the actions of the Australian government, but to my mind the matter is very simple. If you release foreign exchange to the Indonesian government so they can purchase arms from abroad, it is most certainly helping their aggression against Malaysia.

I would again appeal to the minister to do one of two or three things. First of all, the minister should try to get assurances from Dr. Sukarno that he will desist in his aggression against Malaysia, and in that case by all means let this wheat flour go there. If that kind of assurance cannot be obtained,

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

then I would suggest to the minister that this gift of wheat flour might well be transferred to the people of Malaysia, who are the subject of Dr. Sukarno's aggressions. Failing that, if the minister is dead set on giving some sort of aid to Indonesia and to Dr. Sukarno, let us say that we will not give him materials, whether they be food or anything else, which will enable him to save on foreign exchange to buy arms, but that we will expand our student training program and train more Indonesian students.

That is a long range project, and when Dr. Sukarno has passed to the great beyond and his policies with him, we hope, then the students who received training in this country or elsewhere will really be able to do some work toward developing their country in a peaceful way. If the minister would transfer these funds to the training of Indonesian students I do not think we would have any objections. I would be glad to see it, because it creates good will for the future. But to turn over holus-bolus a large shipment of wheat flour which could probably be used by the Indonesian army, and would also enable the Indonesian government to save on foreign exchange with which it could buy more arms to carry out its aggressions, is something which I think is intolerable. I fail to understand how anybody in this house could support such a move against one of our friendly brother nations in the commonwealth.

Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Chairman, I must say that I was greatly impressed by the high moralistic tone of the hon. member for Oxford in advancing his thesis, which appeared to be that we should use the wealth of this country to enforce on other nations a certain course of action, or force them to refrain from certain courses of action and adopt policies which suit our way of life more than theirs.

The hon. member for Oxford is not carrying his position to its logical conclusion. If, as he says, this is a logical course for the Canadian government to follow, and that it must withhold foodstuffs from countries with whose governments we disagree or of whose actions we disapprove, where is he going to draw the line? Why does he not suggest a more positive line? Why does the member for Oxford not advocate that we take more definitive steps to place embargoes and blockade everything that Indonesia is doing? Why do we not carry out this policy throughout the world, if that is to be the policy of the Canadian government?